

REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 4-8, and 10-19 were pending in the application. Claims 1, 8, 10-13, 16, and 19 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 1-2, 4-8, and 10-19 remain pending in the application.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 1-2, 4-8, 10-11, 13-17, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cyr et al. (U.S. Application No. 2003/0177211) in view of Larson et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0033393). Claims 12 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cyr in view of Larson, and further in view of Reichmeyer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,286,038).

Applicant respectfully submits that Cyr and Larson, whether alone or combined, fail to teach or suggest, “said central resource is configured to generate a client-ID” as recited by claim 1. The Examiner contends that this feature is taught in paragraph [0025], lines 17-19 of Cyr. Applicant respectfully disagrees. In paragraph [0025], lines 17-19, Cyr teaches, “Servers 52, 54, 56 continue to use addresses for geographic loci 60, 62, 64, 66, 68, 70 for leasing or otherwise assigning addressees from address register 92”. (Emphasis added)

While Cyr teaches servers 52, 54, and 56 use the addresses for leasing or assignment purposes, Cyr fails to teach “said central resource is configured to generate a client-ID” as recited by claim 1.

Additionally, Applicant submits that Cyr and Larson, whether alone or combined, fail to teach or suggest, “wherein after generating said client-ID said central resource is configured to store said client-ID in said non-volatile memory” as recited by claim 1. The Examiner contends

Likewise, claim 16 recites features similar to those highlighted above with regard to claim 1, and is therefore believed to patentably distinguish over Cyr and Larson, whether alone or combined, for at least the reasons given in the above paragraphs discussing claim 1. Claims 17-19 are dependent upon claim 16 and are therefore believed to patentably distinguish over the cited reference for at least the same reasons.

Applicant further submits that Cyr and Larson, whether alone or combined, fail to teach or suggest, “when said FRU is replaced with a new FRU, said central resource is configured to retrieve said client-ID from said non-volatile memory and provide said client-id to said new FRU, wherein said new FRU is configured to download said client-ID via said bus” as recited by claim 13. The Examiner contends that this feature is taught in paragraph [0062], lines 7-9 of Larson. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Larson teaches, in paragraph [0062], lines 2-9:

When a new card 300 is inserted in system 100, SMC 300E determines the type of card 300 that was inserted by polling the identification EEPROM 302A of the card 300. Information is retrieved from the EEPROM 302A and added to the hardware fitted table. SMC 300E also configures the new card 300 if it has not been configured, or if its configuration differs from the expected configuration. (Emphasis added)

While Larson teaches determining the type of card 300 by polling the identification EEPROM 302A of the newly inserted card 300, retrieving information from the EEPROM 302A, and SMC 300E configuring the new card 300, Larson fails to teach “when said FRU is replaced with a new FRU, said central resource is configured to retrieve said client-ID from said non-volatile memory and provide said client-id to said new FRU, wherein said new FRU is configured to download said client-ID via said bus” as recited by claim 13. Accordingly, claim 13 is believed to patentably distinguish over Cyr and Larson, whether alone or combined.

Applicant also contends that Cyr and Larson, whether alone or combined, fail to teach or suggest, “said central resource is configured to generate a unique client-ID for each of the plurality of FRU slots and store each client-ID in said non-volatile memory” as recited by claim 8, and “wherein said central resource is a service processor” as recited by claim 10. In

accordance, claims 8 and 10 are believed to patentably distinguish over Cyr and Larson, whether alone or combined.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. If a phone interview would speed allowance of any pending claims, such is requested at the Examiner's convenience.

If any extensions of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) are necessary to prevent the above referenced application(s) from becoming abandoned, Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extensions. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/6000-10001/BNK.

Respectfully submitted,



Mario J. Lewin
Reg. No. 54,268
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, Texas 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800
Date: 6/15/06